THEOLOGY

VOL. LI OCTOBER, 1948 No. 340

Editorial

THERE were some churchmen, perhaps many, and among these the bishops themselves, who doubted whether the meeting of the Lambeth Conference this year would be justified. To bring to Lambeth bishops from all over the world, each with pressing responsibilities in his own diocese, and at great expense, certainly called for justification. But now that the Conference has met and done its work justification is not far to seek. It is evident that the bishops found their meeting abundantly worth while, and that they have returned to their dioceses encouraged and fortified. We are well assured that, in saying that God knit them together in heart and mind, and that all the churches and congregations which they represented may expect to receive strength and encouragement from their interchange of friendship and counsel, they were not merely employing the language of ecclesiastical diplomacy or conventional piety.

Beyond, however, the benefits to the actual participants in the Conference and the effects that will subsequently flow from it, the actual meeting has borne, for all who have eyes to see, a striking witness to the fact that there is on this tormented earth and in this divided world a community, universal in its scope, founded not on race or nationality or ideology, not held in the grip of an authoritarian discipline, but freely bound together in Christ through the Holy Spirit. That so diverse a body of men, and of leaders of men, most of whom had never met one another before, should find themselves at once on common ground, and be able in so short a time to reach and express a common mind on so many of the great human questions, is eloquent and reassuring testimony to the unity of the Spirit which awaits all who will receive it and act upon it. Moreover, the unity of the Anglican Communion, in spite of the perennial forecasts of its impending disruption, has been evidenced perhaps more clearly than ever before. The Amsterdam Conference has borne a witness to unity in Christ on a larger and more imposing scale, but that witness was inevitably less clear and less complete. The World Council of Churches is not and does not claim to be a Church. But both gatherings have in their different ways shown that the living Christ is at work restoring to mankind its lost unity, and have brought confirmation to the promise that at the last day we shall all become one in Him.

Nevertheless, on a shorter view, the Lambeth Conference will be judged chiefly by its published Report. The Archbishop of Canterbury has said that it contains nothing startling. That is true, and it is none the worse for that. It contains no flights of mere rhetoric

and no foolhardy recommendations. Sound and sensible are the epithets that the Report invites, like many other Anglican documents. Its plain, balanced and consistent good sense is reflected in its style, especially in the style of the Encyclical Letter. We do not find here any of that laboured and ponderous biblicism which characterizes the declarations of Protestant churches on the continent, nor of that archaic unction which gives a distinct and curious flavour to papal encyclicals.

One or two preliminary remarks may be made about the range and method of the Report. The Lambeth Conferences were originally intended to be meetings at which the bishops took brotherly counsel together about what may be called the domestic affairs of the Anglican Communion. While this intention has continued to determine the form of the meetings—*e.g.* their privacy—and the greater part of their agenda, yet as time has gone on there has been an increasing tendency to make pronouncements on all manner of subjects concerning which the world is deemed to need instruction, correction or exhortation. It is natural that the bishops should feel moved to address themselves to these topics of universal concern; indeed, it is their duty and office to do so. But it may be doubted whether the Lambeth Conference should be used for this purpose. There are other bodies, notably the World Council of Churches, which are now more capable of producing reports on, for example, the Christian doctrine of man, and it might be well if the Lambeth Conference deliberately restricted itself to its original intention of dealing with the affairs and concerns of the Anglican Communion, which certainly provide material enough for its deliberations.

We also doubt the suitability of including under the term "Resolutions" statements about a wide variety of subjects, many of which are affirmations of belief or exhortations to good conduct rather than resolutions properly so called. A "Resolution" should be a resolution of definite persons to do something definite, and the use of the term by the Lambeth Conference is calculated to encourage the deplorable habit of ecclesiastical assemblies to think they have done something important when they have assented to a good idea about which the actual participants are not in a position to do anything definite at all.

The most ambitious undertaking of the present Conference was the Reports of the Committees on "The Christian Doctrine of Man," "The Church and the Modern World" and "The Christian Way of Life," with the correlative "Resolutions." This whole section, it is said, should be read as a continuous document. The first part (Part II, pp. 2-10) is on a very high level, even if it might have been more digestibly expressed. But after this it becomes very uneven, and at last turns into a meandering omnibus. The section on "The Church and War" (pp. 13-16) seems to us one of the weakest in the whole Report, though admittedly it is a subject on which it was most difficult to say anything fresh or decisive. But it was surely a mistake to reaffirm without qualification the much quoted and much misunderstood "Resolution" of the 1930 Conference: "The Conference

affirms that war as a method of settling international disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ." This raises the expectation that the bishops are going to declare themselves simple pacifists, and in fact most of what they say in this Report is in that vein. "The causes which lead to war are man-made," they say, "and can be removed by man. An overwhelming number of people in the world ardently wish for peace, and although there are serious existing tensions, these should be and can be resolved otherwise than by war. . . . Patience and good will can be brought to bear. Force is never a final solution, since all conflicts are ultimately in the realm of ideas and one cannot kill ideas with bombs. In the long run moral and spiritual forces are the strongest and we must give them a chance to prevail." This sort of statement does not really help us in the short run. It would have been better to admit and express the dreadful perplexity in the minds and consciences of Christians.

On the other hand, the short section on "Communism" (pp. 20-22) is one of the best things in the whole Report, and indeed one of the best statements on the subject that has ever been made in the Christian name. We hope that the distinctions which it draws will be carefully weighed, and its summons to meet Communism positively will be heeded. It happens that when we received the Report we were reading that remarkable and moving book, *Priest-Workman in Germany*, by Henri Perrin, and this may be taken as an illustration of the radical kinds of Christian action and witness that are demanded.

We are profoundly thankful for the long and carefully expressed Report of the Committee on "The Unity of the Church," not least for the warm and sympathetic, the positive and constructive, attitude of the Conference to the Church of South India. The very large measure of agreement that was achieved here is more than could reasonably have been expected in view of the confessed anomalies and uncertainties of the experiment in South India and of the lamentable way in which thought on the subject has been poisoned and confused. The disagreement that remains will hardly be removed until the Church in South India has become more firmly established and has further clarified its faith and order. But the Conference refused to regard its disagreement as final, and in declaring that differences of policy within the Anglican Communion in the meanwhile should not be made "a ground for condemnation of action taken by any Church, Province, or Diocese," the bishops have given an example and set a standard which we hope will everywhere be followed.

The Report of the Committee on "The Anglican Communion" is also a fine piece of work, and should contribute much to the understanding of the Anglican position and to the coherence of our churches throughout the world. The admirable statement on p. 85 about the nature of authority, as understood by Anglicans, would, we think, have been improved if the multiguous term "religious experience" had been avoided, or at least had been carefully defined and accompanied by its biblical equivalent.

The Report on "The Church's Discipline in Marriage" is less

satisfactory, although its chief recommendations are rightly conceived. But an opportunity has been lost of setting forth positive teaching about the nature and mystery of the marriage bond such as is contained, for instance, in Dr G. L. Russell's excellent book *Men and Women.* "Positive instruction in the Christian principles of marriage," as the Report says, is urgently needed; it would have been possible to say something much better and richer about these principles.

The Report of the Committee on "Baptism and Confirmation" should be regarded as an interim document. It will do good service if it sets forward the study of the subject through our Communion. But there is still too much uncertainty about the theological principles involved to permit any definitive resolution of the practical problems. In ten years' time the situation may be more favourable for strong recommendations.

Nothing is said anywhere in the Report about the way in which the Conference was prepared for. If information had been supplied about this, it might have gone far to account for the unevenness of quality which we have noticed. We also think that the time has come to ask some questions about the composition of the Lambeth Conference, and we shall return to that aspect of the subject next month.

* * * * *

We are glad to be able to announce that it is at last possible to increase the circulation of THEOLOGY, and to accept a considerable, though of course not an unlimited, number of new subscribers. We invite our present readers to inform their friends of this fact. S.P.C.K. is ready to send a specimen copy and a subscription form to any whose names and addresses are sent to Northumberland Avenue.

Lang and Temple

The Address in York Minster on July 17, 1948, at the dedication of the pulpit in their memory

It is with great diffidence that I speak today, as we dedicate this pulpit to the memory of Archbishop Lang and Archbishop Temple; here in this great house of God which, taking both lives together, was the centre of their pastoral and administrative activities for five and thirty years. This span of time, hardly more than a long moment in the history of the Minster, covered years of large significance for both Church and State, that of necessity imposed particular responsibility upon the occupants of the See of York.

Both men, though perhaps in somewhat different fashion, were conscious of the centuries-old heritage that belongs to the Church of England, and both were profoundly sensible of the part that the Church could and should take in the whole business of the country's life. Neither of them could think of the Church as a quiet haven or peaceful backwater for a select company anxious to escape the stress and disorder of the world outside; rather must it be always a broad and powerful tributary to the main stream, giving it strength, purpose and direction. For both men too the many-sided activity that the daily round exacted was supported by an intense personal apprehension of the depth of the Christian mystery and of the divine compassion for the frailties and failures of men.

In such large ways they were alike, but in method and achievement they were different. Lang, with his dramatic sense of history, looked back to days when the borderline of Church and State was neither so clearly defined nor so carefully kept as it is today, when all the business of one was all the business of the other, when a Becket might become Archbishop of Canterbury or a Wolsey be first minister of the King. So, when he came to York, Lang set himself—quite deliberately as I read him—to re-establish the office of Archbishop as that of a great Prince of the Church, and as such deeply concerned with all the great affairs of the Realm. And to this end he strove, not from vanity or ambition, but from a strong conviction that in this way he could best make the influence and teaching of the Church effective. "I care little," he once said, "what people think of Cosmo Gordon Lang, but I care very much what they think of the Archbishop of York."

People sometimes misunderstood and misjudged him, regarding him as a great ecclesiastical statesman and mistaking the exaltation of the office for exaltation of the man. They could readily observe the pomp and circumstance of an Archbishop, but did not so easily see through to the man behind, who passionately loved beauty in all its countless forms whether of nature or of man, who rejoiced in the companionship and laughter of friends, who walked very humbly with his God, and whose inner life was spent in prayer. A manuscript note was found after his death recording the feeling with which he approached the day of his ordination. It begins with two lines that are familiar to many and that were constantly in his thought:

O Love, I give myself to thee,
Thine ever, only Thine to be.

And then the note goes on:

This day I consecrate all that I have or hope to be to Thy Service.
All that I have been I lay at the foot of the Cross . . .
From this day forth, O Master, take my life and let it be ever, only, all for Thee.

Here in York we knew him better than the world outside. We were conscious that the dignity and ceremony with which he sought to enrich public worship or public function was not designed to any end smaller than that of the greater glory of God and of His Church. And how superbly he met every demand of this kind that circumstance made of him! Many here will recall the celebration in 1927 of the 1300th anniversary of this Minster's foundation, with the Archbishop himself the central figure, magnificent in presence and voice, moved to almost more than his natural eloquence by the vision of the great Christian procession down the ages influencing and moulding every side of national thought and action.

With such a history the Church could never be merely a passive observer of the sweeping social movements of his time or of the baffling problems of world order, since all secular problems had, as he so often insisted, a spiritual origin and would yield only to spiritual forces. Here therefore Church and State met on ground where the Church had the right and duty to make her voice heard. Few were better equipped than Lang to be her spokesman. And what he had to say with all the authority of his office and of his own personality was assured of the respect always accorded to one who speaks from knowledge and wisdom and is not afraid to utter unwelcome truths when his conscience forbids him to be silent.

The emphasis of Temple's approach was different. Foremost in his mind was the need to rebuild the social teaching of the Church, to give, as it were, to secular policy a theological foundation. A philosopher and scholar, whatever he wrote or said commanded the attention of thinkers in every land, and his Gifford Lectures on *Nature, Man and God* were a contribution of the first importance to philosophic thought. But to his role of philosopher Temple added the dynamic quality of a leader of men. The work of the Church, as he saw it, was not done until the general principles which it was its duty to proclaim had been made intelligible to the general body of citizens and, so far as might be, had won their convinced obedience. He therefore brought the argument from the study into the arena. He turned his philosophy into a working, fighting creed, which must inevitably disturb and alarm many people, but which could hardly be ignored. In the strength of this creed he went out to win the allegiance of a multitude who were not philosophers and may not even have been Christians. He was at his best when he spoke to the younger men and women of his day. They felt, as they did not always feel with leaders of the Church, that he knew exactly where he wanted to go and where he wanted them to follow. They respected his intellectual

integrity, his refusal to play up to the gallery or down to the stalls, and the complete fearlessness with which he was ready to champion unpopular opinion. I should guess that Temple valued his high place in the Church very largely and perhaps chiefly for the opportunities it gave him with the younger generation, and that by comparison no other work lay quite so near his heart.

The Dean of Lichfield, in his admirable *Life of William Temple*, tells how, when he was taking a mission at Oxford in 1931, on its closing night the hymn "When I survey the Wondrous Cross" was being sung. At the last verse Temple stopped the singing and said: "I want you to read over this verse before you sing it. They are tremendous words. If you mean them with all your hearts, sing them as loud as you can. If you don't mean them at all, keep silent. If you mean them even a little, and want to mean them more, sing them very softly"; and 2,000 young men and women whispered Isaac Watts's words. That was no facile trick of a skilful missioner. Those words must mean everything or nothing; and for Temple "the whole realm of nature" was truly "an offering far too small." He indeed was ready to surrender his soul, his life, his all to the Love of God.

Some words of his that I read many years ago have remained in my mind. "Worship," he wrote, "is the submission of all our nature to God. It is the quickening of conscience by His holiness, the nourishment of mind with His truth, the purifying of imagination by His beauty, the opening of the heart to His love, the surrender of will to His purpose—and all this gathered up in adoration, the most selfless emotion of which our nature is capable, and therefore the chief remedy for that self-centredness which is our original sin and the source of all actual sin."

It was this remarkable combination of scholarship with deep faith that gave to his life, in spite of the overpowering claims of work, a quality of buoyant vigour that acted like a tonic on persons and things around him. And he himself drew freely upon the enjoyment of his large and varied society of friends, the refreshment that comes with reading, and the beauty of the Lake Country, which held so large and special a place in his affection. What fun, too, it was to hear and to watch those great gales of laughter which would sweep over him when he was in congenial company and something appealed to his sense of humour! Truly he was a gay crusader, one of a long line of militant churchmen, fighting God's battles with joyful heart, as he looked out on the good things which God had given to support His soldiers in their warfare.

Broad generalities are always dangerous; but I would venture to assert my thought that the difference between Lang and Temple was in part that of priest and prophet. The Church has always needed, and will always need, both; the good priest and the true prophet. Without the priest the Church could not continue. His work is often prosaic, uninteresting and unpopular, but it is work that must be done if the corporate life of the Church is to survive. Without the prophet the Church would lose the impulse and life without which it would degenerate into an organization, self-centred, self-satisfied, an end in itself. But if Lang was primarily the priest, he had in him much of

the prophet, and no one on occasion could speak words more winged or lift his hearers on them to greater heights of thought and feeling. And if Temple was primarily the prophet, he was—as I need not say in York—a great priest, diligent in his care for the diocese, in the management of its affairs and in the divine service. When William Temple was an undergraduate at Oxford he went to hear a sermon by Lang, then Bishop of Stepney. "I think he is very great," the young man wrote afterwards to his mother. He had had to listen intently so as not to lose the inevitable connexion of the preacher's points. The pleasure was intellectual, not emotional; but, he wrote, "when I come to his text afterwards, I can remember all his points, just because their connexion is inevitable." That was written of Lang the prophet. Many years afterwards, when Lang was at Canterbury and Temple at York, the latter shouldered his full share of the common burden of administration; and when in 1938 a Round Table Conference of great import for the future peace of the Church was convened at Lambeth it was the Archbishop of York who took the chair and guided the proceedings. That was Temple the priest.

In this too they were alike. Neither man, amid all the clamorous demands of Church or world, lost his sense of pastoral responsibility or forgot that in a final reckoning he must be judged by his care for the individual souls committed to his charge. Of this pastoral work it would be presumptuous to speak; but both Lang and Temple have the unspoken witness of a host of men and women in every walk of life to whom they brought comfort in sorrow, relief in perplexity, the healing of the Gospel, and the wise counsel of a patient and understanding Father in God.

Let me end with one more point of similarity; and that in what is perhaps the most compelling cause and opportunity of our day—the devotion of both men to the cause of Christian reunion. They saw division as a grievous sin, its mending as one of their obligations. Many years before, when he was about to be ordained, Lang had put down the unity of the Church as one of the great purposes to which his life as a priest must be devoted. And to this obligation he remained faithful to the end. At the Lambeth Conference of 1920 the appeal to all Christian people raised the whole matter of reunion to a different plane. Before 1920 it had been a vague aspiration: after 1920 it became a practical issue. If the appeal itself was largely the work of Lang, who, first at York and then at Canterbury, took the lead in discussion and negotiation, it was the untiring energy of Temple which carried the claim of unity to conference after conference, far beyond the bounds of the Anglican Communion.

It is, therefore, altogether fitting that we should be here today to receive this memorial to these men, both of whom loved the Minster well and gave faithful service to the diocese and province and the wider Church beyond. Minster, Diocese, Province and Church—all are the richer for their work and their devotion. Let us then today thank God for their example and pray that the memory of it may remain, and bring men to give themselves, as they did, to His service.

HALIFAX.

The Evangelicals and the Ministry

THOUGH controversy between two schools of thought in the Church of England is familiar in every generation, it seldom happens that a theologian of one school declares that the adherents of the other do not believe in the same God. It happened in 1864, when Pusey declared that he and Maurice worshipped different Gods, and the consciences of many were shocked at the time. Now something very like it has happened again, for Bishop Stephen Neill writes in connexion with the problem of the ministry: "We must not deceive ourselves by refusing to face the fact that what makes one give different answers from another is that we do not believe in the same kind of God, or at least do not believe in God in the same way." If this means that those who hold a "catholic" view of the ministry do so as a result of a sub-Christian conception of God, it is a terrible utterance, such as the writer might well come to regret. But if it means that some deep differences in our *thought* about God's relation to man, the world and history underlie our differences about the ministry, then we may be thankful that Bishop Neill says so. It is nearer to the truth of the matter than is the common opinion that no major differences in theology divide us, and that it is *only* the ministry which is the problem.

Whatever they mean, Bishop Neill's words show that we have come to a pretty pass in the Anglican Communion, and that we must leave nothing undone in trying to understand one another better. The words occur in the little book *The Ministry of the Church*, in which a group of evangelical scholars review the essays contained in *The Apostolic Ministry*; and, though the book was briefly reviewed in the April THEOLOGY, so much is at stake that no apology is needed for continuing the discussion.

(1) There is first the controversy on Justification by Faith. I do not myself share the uneasiness which one of the writers in *The Apostolic Ministry* shows concerning Justification by Faith Alone; for, while I agree that certain common applications of the doctrine made chaos of the doctrine of the visible Church, I believe that upon Justification Protestantism had *something* true and positive to say. If the word "Alone" means "not by works," I can subscribe wholeheartedly to Article XI. And I am sure that there are many Anglo-Catholics who are with me in valuing the catholic doctrine of the sacraments and the ministry because it expresses to them the prevenience, the objectivity, the givenness of the grace of God and the secondary character of receptivity and response. This *is* Justification by Faith. Nowhere more than in the Confessional may men know that all is of God's free grace in accepting them though they be sinners, and that nothing of their own—works or merit or even contrition—serves to earn their salvation. Similarly, what is most to be regretted about Protestantism is the extent to which, by abandoning the catholic conception of the sacramental gifts of God, it allows its true perception about Justification to decline into subjective piety and personal feelings. We are all in danger of turning faith into a work by which we earn salvation.

(2) Akin to this is the question of the *personal* character of the grace

of God. Let it be acknowledged that the Reformation bore witness to the truth that grace is the personal act of the living Christ. Let it be admitted that it is too often a fault to use impersonal language about grace, and to allow that language to colour thought about it. But it has been the unceasing concern of responsible Catholic teachers to emphasize the personal character of grace; and it is regrettable that Mr Moule should regard it as axiomatic that Dr Farrer and Dr Thornton hold an *impersonal* idea of grace (p. 45). It is an unwarranted assumption that the transmission of authority in succession involves of itself an impersonal conception. Such a conception is no more involved when a bishop ordains because he has, in virtue of succession, authority to ordain, than when a congregation sets a man apart to be an authorized minister of word and sacraments. Whence comes Mr Moule's confident assumption? Does it perhaps come from a tendency to limit what is personal in religion to what is *felt* in personal terms? If so, it seems worth saying that we do not in ordinary life so limit our idea of personal relationship and personal influence, for the personal influence of one man upon another includes a host of unconscious, unfelt interactions. And, if a friend should bid me to meet him at a prescribed time and place and under explicit instructions, I do not complain that his kindly directions make the relationship "impersonal."

(3) Again, the evangelical writers are concerned at any denial of the activity of the Holy Spirit within the non-episcopal communions. The authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* are clear that God does bless and use non-episcopal ministries, and also that those are not the same thing as the Catholic ministry. But I think it is wholly unreasonable when Bishop Neill complains that they do not define the status of the non-episcopal ministries. It is hard enough to define the operations of the grace of God in the regular ministries, and indeed the evangelicals often complain that too much definition in connexion with the working of grace is attempted altogether. To mention a parallel problem, is Bishop Neill prepared to define the status of the Quakers and the operations of grace among them? He would surely not deny to them the title of Christian nor doubt that the Spirit has worked among them; yet he is committed to the belief that sacraments are "necessary to salvation." What then? Perhaps when he is ready to define what happens in their case, the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* may fairly be expected to define the problem which he puts to them. But in general I think that Free Churchmen are treated just as ambiguously, and perhaps with a more brutal ambiguity, by the method of the 1921 Declaration on "Real Ministries," for this declaration affirms a virtual equality of status and then hedges the affirmation with qualifications about "respective spheres." It is not only that Dr Kirk has submitted the declaration to a searching criticism which has not yet received an answer (Mr Hickinbotham merely dismisses it as "special pleading," p. 40); it is that Free Churchmen have shown themselves puzzled to know just what the declaration means, for if they have "real ministries," why may they not celebrate in the parish churches? The late Bernard Manning used to describe the declaration as "taking

away with one hand what you offer with the other." Is it really a position morally and spiritually so inferior, and even (as Bishop Neill suggests) sub-Christian, to say (as "Catholic" churchmen commonly do) that God has blessed and used Free Church ministrations, and yet the words "real" and "valid" properly belong to what has Catholic authority in relation to the Church's catholicity?

Bishop Neill makes elaborate use of the old "shipwrecked communicants" argument. If all the bishops were rounded up and destroyed, or if a body of laymen were utterly and indefinitely cut off from the regular ministry, would the Church still exist, and would sacramental acts in the Church's name be possible? The argument by no means makes the doctrine of succession so absurd or unChristian as Bishop Neill seems to think it does. A man's eyes and hands and feet are of the *esse* of his body, with functions not normally interchangeable: they are not utility arrangements like his clothes. Yet men have survived and worked without hands, and moved without feet, and (thanks to Braille) read without eyes. But these merciful possibilities do not involve us in doubting that the organs given by the Creator are integral to the body itself in its proper *being* and unity.

(4) What conception of the bishop's office do the evangelical scholars offer in place of that which they criticize? The nearest approach to a systematic treatment comes in the concluding paragraphs of Prof. Greenslade's essay: "What authority must a minister have, and how can he get it? I believe that he is not only a minister of the Church, for which he needs authority conferred by the Church, but also acts for Christ to it, and needs divine authority. How can he be sure that he has the latter? His own conviction of a call and choice by a congregation are not sufficient. But when to these is added the deliberate and solemn presentation to Christ, with prayer that he shall be accepted and enabled for his ministry, then, I believe, we should be content in faith. It seems to me timorous to say that divine authority can only be given by or trusted by succession. . . . If, however, episcopacy in apostolic succession is held necessary, not to transmit divine authority but as an organ for conferring ecclesiastical authority, then . . . I hope the non-episcopal churches will accept this way of reaching a fuller visible unity, and so will welcome episcopacy-in-succession, whatever its origin, not as something tolerable because unimportant, but as something which can become a valuable visible expression of the unity of the Church in space and time" (pp. 60-61).

For the sake of brevity I have omitted some of Prof. Greenslade's text, but I hope I have faithfully reproduced his meaning. It seems to be an important statement, both as welcoming the episcopate and as indicating what we are involved in theologically if we reject the doctrine of apostolic succession. Prof. Greenslade separates (*a*) divine authority and (*b*) ecclesiastical authority. The first is bestowed in *any* ordination sincerely performed by *any* group of Christians with the right intentions. The latter is best (though not of necessity) bestowed by the bishop. But does the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ allow the separation of authority into these two compartments? The separation seems to me to cut at the heart of the inner meaning

of our ministry. The authority of Christ and the authority of the Church are not indeed identical, but they overlap and interpenetrate—and the work of the ministry constantly presupposes this interpenetration. When, for instance, a priest absolves a penitent in the name of Christ and of the Church, he does not do so partly as representing Christ and partly as representing the Church as a sort of democracy—but in the name of Christ acting in and through His Church. Is it otherwise with the eucharist and with ordination? When a bishop says "Take thou authority for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God," it is not as if there is something called ecclesiastical authority which the bishop bestows as part of some ecclesiastical arrangement, and something else called divine authority which might be obtained from any Christian acting on behalf of any congregation. The integral unity and interpenetration of Christ's authority and the Church's authority were powerfully expressed by Archbishop William Temple: "When I consecrate a godly and learned man to the office and rank of a bishop in the Church of God, I do not act as a representative of the Church, if by that is meant the whole number of contemporary Christians; but I do act as the ministerial instrument of Christ in His body the Church. The authority by which I act is His, transmitted to me through the apostles and those to whom they committed it; I hold it neither from the Church nor apart from the Church, but from Christ in the Church." An issue more fundamental than succession or no succession is at stake—the relation between Christ and the visible Church. The view expressed by Prof. Greenslade seems to drive a coach and four through the unity of conception which the Archbishop's words describe.

(5) What of the claim made by Mr Hickinbotham (pp. 40-41) that the apostolic succession is not a part of the doctrine of the Church of England? Here two different attitudes towards our Anglican formularies come into view. I can only attempt to describe the one which I hold myself. I see in our formularies a deliberate comprehensiveness and an indication of those limits within which an Anglican is directed to believe and to teach. I see also what seems to me a real unsatisfactoriness in using the Articles as a manual for systematic teaching on a good many subjects: *e.g.* the Articles on Man deal with those aspects of man's sinfulness which were being debated at the time and give us little help for a positive doctrine of the *imago Dei*. But I learn also from the formularies the duty of appealing to scripture and to antiquity; and when the Church of England deliberately continues the office and work of a bishop with those functions which belonged to him in antiquity, our duty seems primarily, not to construct a doctrine from sixteenth- and seventeenth-century opinions and precedents, but to ask what was in antiquity the meaning of the bishop's commission in relation to the Church as catholic and apostolic. The Tractarians employed the appeal to antiquity with a lack of historical discrimination, and were wont to ascribe St Augustine's particular conceptions to the earlier fathers. This error must be avoided, but there *is* an essential meaning belonging to the bishop's office in the pre-Nicene Church, and there *is* a real correspondence between this and the office

of the Apostle. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral had its origin, not in an attempt to find an impressive and effective method of getting a common ecclesiastical authority, but in an attempt to appeal to those principles of unity which existed in antiquity.

I do not want to end this article upon a polemical note. There are points in this controversy where little signs of the possibility of synthesis or reconciliation have been apparent, and the partial welcome given in the evangelical volume to Fr Hebert's essay is one of these signs. But to those who are looking for mutual understanding the recurring implication of Bishop Neill that he and his colleagues hold a more "spiritual" or "ethical" or "personal" type of Christianity is disconcerting. It shows the need for us to understand better what our doctrines and practices mean to us severally in the sphere of religion. And as a tiny attempt to contribute to this understanding I would end with one remark. If we desire (and the evangelicals join with us in desiring) "a ministry in succession as a symbol of the Church's unity in time and place," I find it easier to think of this as something once given by God among the sacramental gifts which belong to the Body of Christ than to think of it as a sort of device for securing "ecclesiastical authority." The former conception appeals to the evangelical in me, being congruous with the God-givenness of the Church in history. The latter conception seems a mixture of ecclesiasticism and pelagianism, and I am blind to the higher spirituality which is claimed for it.

MICHAEL RAMSEY.

Hosea and the Virgin Birth

IT is becoming recognized that the function and purpose of Scriptural quotation by the New Testament authors was not simply to provide snappily convincing proof-texts. It was much more to expose the profound harmony of the events they had witnessed in these latter days with certain "typical" dealings of Yahweh with His people in the past and to demonstrate their authenticity as saving acts of God by their congruity with what was already known of the peculiar characteristics of His working. There was a certain divine pattern which, like a watermark, they believed could be detected repeating itself in any genuine piece of *Heilsgeschichte*. The outlines of this pattern were given in the main in the events of Israel's national history, but they could equally well appear in the much smaller scale of an individual's life story.

There is one such individual life whose pattern is clearly regarded by the New Testament as a "type" of divine action—the marriage-history of the prophet Hosea. Hos. i, 10 ("In the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God") and ii, 23 ("I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and will say unto them which were not my people, Thou art my people") are both cited by two different N.T. authors (Rom. ix, 25*f.*; 1 Pet. ii, 10) to show that the method of

the divine salvation which involved the nomination of the gentile Christian Church as the People of the Covenant, in place of the Jews, was nothing strange to the ways of God. In fact, it was "typical" of the way He worked. It is interesting to extend this line of thought beyond the immediate polemical issue with which the writers were concerned—namely, the status of the Church as the New Israel—and to view the congruity of the Incarnation itself, and especially of the Virgin Birth, with this particular "type" of the divine method.

The "type" may be described thus. God made men for a relationship of love with Himself, of which the marriage bond is not a wholly inadequate human analogy. Men have repudiated that relationship with Him, committed adultery against Him. But, despite this unfaithfulness, God deliberately goes out to contract a formal relationship of marriage with them—He makes a covenant with them, to establish on the basis of law what as a fact of love no longer exists. This Hosea sees typified in God's injunction to him to take as his wife a woman known to be of loose morals. (This literal interpretation of "a wife of whoredom" [i, 2] seems more consonant with the realities of Israel's moral status before God. Even though her condition was to get very much worse by comparison, it is difficult to imagine any prophet regarding Israel at any point of her history as the pure spouse of Yahweh.) The purpose of this divine marriage is to have children, who are to represent the offspring and embodiment of unfaithfulness. Hosea is bidden call his daughter and son "No Mercy" and "No People": they are vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction, created by God to be the reminder of Israel's apostasy and the sign of her hopelessness. And yet the ultimate purpose of their creation is to be the instruments of God's mercy, to reveal the glory of His forgiving power, which, contrary to all desert and hope, justifies men by the action of free and unmerited grace. It is this divine favour or "good pleasure" which calls "her beloved, which was not beloved" (ii, 23, LXX) and causes that "in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." And this same sheer grace and undeterable love goes on to justify and receive back the wife too (the body of Israel), even though she has gone from iniquity unto iniquity and requires to be purged and purified "many days."

Here, as it were, within the total divine strategy, is the blue-print for "operation salvation," ready for the day when it shall be put into effect. It is the "typical" action-pattern of the genuine divine *agape*—deliberately choosing to work through a reversal of all human judgment, to reveal the more unequivocally the quality and greatness of its power. It is this action-pattern which the N.T. authors, and Paul in particular, see expressed supremely in the life and death of Jesus Christ, and which can legitimately be extended to the understanding of His birth.

The first and most indisputable fact about the birth of Jesus is that it occurred out of wedlock. The one alternative for which there is absolutely no evidence is that Jesus was the lawful son of Joseph and Mary. The only choice open to us is between a virgin birth and an

illegitimate birth. The historical evidence and the requirements of doctrine seem to me to point definitely in favour of the former. But this is not the place in which to argue the issue. Suffice it to say that Christianity has a real interest in insisting upon the virgin birth as a symbol of the truth that the Word was made flesh, "not of the will of man, but of God," that in Christ was something wholly new in history which could not be produced simply from within the natural process of generation.

But the relevant point here is that, whatever be the truth on this issue, God elected, in becoming incarnate, to be born of a woman not in lawful wedlock. At once we have the scandal of the divine *agape* revealing itself as an affront to all human righteousness. Joseph "being a righteous man . . . was minded to put her away" (Matt. i, 19). The Jews found it impossible to accept a Messiah who had not even a father to give him a name ("Is not this . . . the son of Mary?" (Mark vi, 3)). "We were not born of fornication," they exclaim with scarcely veiled innuendo (John viii, 41). But such is the quality of the divine good pleasure that it authenticates itself as genuine precisely in the offence of human and legal righteousness. God renews His covenant, His marriage contract, with His people. In actual physical association with sinful human flesh is begotten One who, not only in His death, but in His birth, bore the curse of the Law, symbolizing in Himself all that it meant to be No People and Without Mercy, Unbeloved and No Son. And yet, by the shocking verdict of the divine good grace, it is He of whom it is declared, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." And through Him, and the undeterable love of God which the Incarnation reveals, there is the promise too of the redemption of the mother, of the world that bore Him—the right offered to those who believe on His name themselves to become sons of the living God.

Thus the typical pattern of God's redemptive work is repeated. What Hosea saw as promise the Church sees as fact. Thus viewed, the Virgin Birth fits into that harmony which the N.T. writers detect as unifying both the former and the later acts of God, the old and the new covenants, in the single action-pattern of the divine love. It may also help us to understand aright the significance within the whole plan of campaign which Christ's manner of birth is meant to hold. Its lesson is not that the human partner in God's redeeming act must be morally fitted to the love that selects her (the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception). That is humanly impossible. Rather it is that God, as always, deliberately chooses the weak and the sinful things of this world to confound the mighty and convict the righteous.

John A. T. Robinson.

Why You Should Read It—XIV

An Authentic Narrative of some Interesting Particulars in the Life of John Newton[1]

In a letter dated January 27, 1758, Newton writes to his friend, William Bull, the Independent minister at Newport Pagnell: "I have written three or four pages since you were here, in the little book I showed you. It is to be but the size of a shilling pamphlet; and if I go on as I have begun, it may be finished before Christmas: I dare not say I am absolutely idle, or that I wistfully waste much of my time. I think I could complete my book in five or six days, if I had nothing else to do; but I have seldom one hour free from interruption. I have a good many sheep and lambs to look after, sick and afflicted souls, dear to the Lord; and therefore whatever stands still, these must not be neglected. Amongst these various avocations, night comes before I am ready for noon, and the week closes when, according to the state of my business, it should not be more than Tuesday."[2] This quotation not only tells us something of the size of the Authentic Narrative and the conditions under which it was written, but it also reveals something of the author's attitude to his pastoral work as curate of Olney and radiates that playfulness which is typical of the man and is often overlooked by his detractors. The actual completion of the writing which might, as he says, have taken only five or six days took him nearly five years, so that it was not till September 28, 1762, that he could write to Bull: "Finished today the brief account of the Lord's gracious dealings with me from my infancy to the time of my settlement here. I pray God this little sketch may animate those who peruse it to praise the exceeding riches of His goodness to an unworthy wretch."[3] It was circulated for a while in manuscript, but in 1764 it appeared in print with a preface by Thomas Haweis, Rector of Aldwinckle and senior chaplain to the Countess of Huntingdon; the book itself was written in the form of letters to Haweis, which is a little surprising as Newton had little sympathy with Haweis' undenominational Anglicanism, though this difference became apparent at a later date when the Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion was disclaimed by the Church of England and Haweis became a leading light in the non-denominational London Missionary Society, which Newton refused to join, preferring to wait for the Church Missionary Society, of which he was one of the chief founders, if not the chief founder. In this and in several other matters Newton's influence and importance have been largely overlooked. Sir G. O. Trevelyan was not far from the truth when he called Newton "the real founder of that school in the Church of England of which in after years Zachary Macaulay

[1] According to the British Museum Catalogue there have been at least twenty-four editions of the *Narrative*, the majority having appeared before Newton's death in 1808. The most recent editions were published in 1916 with a preface by F. Hamilton and in 1925 under the title *Out of the Depths*. Josiah Bull's *John Newton's Autobiography and Narrative* (1869) is good and sometimes available, as also is Richard Cecil's *Memoirs of the Rev. John Newton* (1808).

[2] J. Newton, *Letters to W. Bull*, 1847, p. 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

was a devoted member"[1]; the primary documents of the period are revealing that it was due as much to Newton as to Simeon that Evangelicalism developed within the Anglican fold, with a loyalty to Church order often underestimated.

The publication of the Narrative had an immediate effect in Olney. Newton himself said, "The people stare at me since reading them, and well they may. I am indeed a wonder to many, a wonder to myself; especially I wonder that I wonder no more." The strange adventures the Narrative tells excited great interest and probably account for the large congregations that attended St Mary Woolnoth, Lombard Street, after his removal there in 1779, and it also probably provided Newton with the opportunity of becoming a father in God to William Wilberforce, Hannah More and Claudius Buchanan, to mention only three. By 1794 the Narrative had gained for Newton such a worldwide reputation that he was able to write, "Now, this worthless name, through thy blessing on my writings, is mentioned with favour by people of different languages, and from India and New Holland to Labrador." In the following year he wrote, "The annals of thy Church can scarcely afford a case so remarkably singular as mine." This is a good comment, which makes one ask two questions: first, if his case was so remarkably singular, why is the Narrative so neglected? And, secondly, what, in Lord David Cecil's words, makes it "one of the most fantastic fairy-tales that was ever the true story of a human being"?[2]

The first question is relatively easy to answer. The Narrative told only of the first half of Newton's life till his ordination, and as the latter half was packed with interest people preferred to read Cecil's Memoir, which appeared in 1808, containing the substance though not the text of the Narrative, and completing the story from first-hand material. However, according to Edward Bickersteth, both were neglected by 1835, "the first because it is incomplete, the second because Mr N.'s own narrative is not given in it."[3]

With regard to the other question, it would be difficult even today to find an autobiography which tells so strange a tale, which includes one of the most beautiful love stories of all time, and an account of a conversion as dramatic and as decisive as those of St Paul and St Augustine. Newton's father was a shipmaster in the Mediterranean trade, his mother a dissenter who brought him up with a view to the ministry "if the Lord should so incline his heart." But his mother died when he was six, and at eleven his father took him to sea, where he soon became a rough diamond though maintaining a lively interest in intellectual pursuits. In 1742, when he was seventeen, his father arranged with a Liverpool merchant that John should go to Jamaica, and John agreed. A week before he set sail he visited some of his mother's relatives in Kent, whom he had not previously met.

"My friends had two daughters: the eldest had often been considered,

[1] G. O. Trevelyan, *Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, 1876, vol. i, p. 9.
[2] Lord David Cecil, *The Stricken Deer*, 1946, p. 111.
[3] Introductory Observations by E. Bickersteth in an anonymous *Memoir of Rev. John Newton*, 1835, p. vii.

by her mother and mine, as a future wife for me from the time of her birth. . . . Almost at the first sight of this girl (for she was then under fourteen) I was impressed with an affection for her, which never abated nor lost its influence a single moment in my heart from that hour. In degree it actually equalled all that the writers of romance have ever imagined; in duration it was unalterable. I soon lost all sense of religion and became deaf to the remonstrances of conscience and prudence; but my regard for her was always the same: and I may perhaps venture to say, that none of the scenes of misery and wickedness I afterwards experienced, ever banished her a single hour together from my waking thoughts, for the seven following years."[1] The writers of romance have more than trebled their output since those words were written, but there are still few romances either in fiction or history whose intensity and beauty surpass that of John Newton and Mary Catlett. On the voyage to Madeira he contemplated suicide, but "my love to M—— C—— was now the only restraint I had left; though I neither feared God nor regarded man, I could not bear that *she* should think meanly of me when I was dead."[2]

His love for Mary made him overstay his leave, miss his ship and get impressed into the Navy on board H.M.S. *Harwich*; and a further indiscretion led to his being degraded from his rank as midshipman and flogged. The boat was bound for the East Indies, but John determined not to go that far. He so embarrassed the captain by his pranks that at Madeira he was able to secure an exchange on to a boat sailing for Sierra Leone. Here the boy's impishness made him a further enemy in his new captain. "Upon some imagined affront, I made a song in which I ridiculed his ship, his designs, and his person, and soon taught it to the whole ship's company."[3]

At Sierra Leone he left the ship hoping for a profitable partnership with a white slave-trader with a black mistress. The negress took a strong dislike to John and maltreated him in such a way that he became almost a Caliban, pulling up roots, accepting food from the slaves themselves and fishing in remote parts of the island with fowl entrails for bait.

Although in his habits he was almost "a white man grown black," his mind was still amazingly alert. "I had bought," he says, "Barrow's Euclid at Plymouth; it was the only volume I had brought on shore; it was always with me, and I used to take it to the remoter corners of the island by the seaside, and draw my *diagrams* with a long stick upon the sand. Thus I often beguiled my sorrows and almost forgot my distress:—and thus, I made myself, in a good measure, master of the first six books of Euclid."[4]

After a brief term with a kinder master Newton was picked up by a friend of his father's and set sail for home. His adventures, however, were not over. On March 9 (old style), 1748, they ran into a storm at night: it lasted till six o'clock the following evening. For Newton "the Lord's time was come." During the first day he was at the pumps fighting what seemed a hopeless battle. The next morning he was

[1] *Memoir*, 1835, p. 11.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 25.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 28.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 37.

called upon to steer the ship, and as he steered he thought back over his life and texts learnt at his mother's knee. The storm's fury abated; "I thought I saw the hand of God displayed in our favour; I could not utter the prayer of faith, I could not draw near to a reconciled God and call him father: my prayer was like the cry of the ravens, which yet the Lord does not disdain to hear. I now began to think of the Jesus whom I had so often derided; I recollected the particulars of his life and of his death; a death for sins not *his* own, but, as I remembered, for the sake of those who, in their distress, put their trust in him."[1]

Every year till his death in 1808 Newton kept this anniversary, usually in seclusion, occupying himself in prayer and fasting and recollection; after his wife's death on December 15, 1790, he kept her anniversary in a similar way, but also writing pathetic little elegies in her memory. But though Newton was converted in 1748, it was more than five years before he found real Christian friendship and the fellowship of Christ's Church; this may account for the anomaly, often noticed, of a Christian slave captain enjoying sweet communion with his God, or teaching himself Latin literature, while fellow human beings suffered the miseries of the Middle Passage below deck. The truth was that Newton, without the advantage of Christian acquaintance, only gradually realized the inconsistency of much of his life and profession. On his return he "went twice a day to the prayers at church, and determined to receive the sacrament at the next opportunity. A few days before I signified my intention to the minister, as the rubric directs; but I found the practice was grown obsolete. At length the day came: I arose very early, was very particular and earnest in my private devotion, and, with the greatest solemnity, engaged myself to be the Lord's for ever, and only his."[2] To keep this vow was by no means easy. He seems to have found no spiritual adviser either in Ireland or Liverpool; he was months on end at sea, where he conducted the services according to the Liturgy twice a Sunday. Once at Charlestown, in South Carolina, he heard a dissenting minster who impressed him, but he did not really find the fellowship of the Church till he met a London captain, called Clunie, in the West Indies with whom he used to study the Bible. "He encouraged me to open my mouth in social prayer, he taught me the advantage of Christian converse; he put me upon an attempt to make my profession more public, and to venture to speak for God. From him, or rather from the Lord, by his means, I received an increase of knowledge: my conceptions became clearer and more evangelical, and I was delivered from a fear which had long troubled me, the fear of relapsing into my former apostasy."[3]

Soon after this meeting Newton was able to leave the slave trade, and at this point in the Narrative he gives his own views on an occupation which he might have forsaken earlier had he met Clunie sooner. "During the time I was engaged in the slave trade, I never had the least scruple as to its lawfulness; I was upon the whole, satisfied

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 53. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 63. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

with it as the appointment Providence had marked out for me; yet it was in many respects far from eligible. It is indeed, accounted a genteel employment, and is usually very profitable, though to me it did not prove so, the Lord seeing that a large increase in wealth could not be good for me. However, I considered myself as a sort of *gaoler* or *turnkey*; and I was sometimes shocked with an employment that was perpetually conversant with chains, bolts and shackles. In this view I had often petitioned in my prayers that the Lord (in his own time) would be pleased to fix me in a more humane calling."[1] How Newton persuaded Wilberforce to stay in Parliament so that he might be near Pitt, how Newton himself gave evidence in the House against the trade, and how his enthusiasm was partly responsible for C.M.S. missions to Sierra Leone to compensate in small measure for the evil to Africa of the slave trade, lies outside the scope of the Narrative; but it is only fair to Newton to note these things.

The above extracts give something of the flavour of Newton's prose; although it is interspersed with much pious comment and long excursions into the way God had rescued him and was preserving him by special providences, it is still eminently readable, for its weakness is more than balanced by a vigorous, racy narrative in simple, lucid prose with the whole written with an objectivity remarkable in a biography, let alone an autobiography. One fragment has been claimed by Dr Cairns "as vivid and realistic as anything in Defoe or Marryat," and Edward Fitzgerald has said of his *Letters to a Wife*, written during his later voyages, "It contains some of the most beautiful things I have ever read: fine feeling in fine English"[2]; the same is true of some of his hymns. Next to the hymns, the Narrative deserves to be best known, because it contains these qualities, as well as giving us one of the most remarkable of autobiographies. It may be added that the impish wit, the powers of imagination, the lessons learnt by the hardest of lives must have made Newton a more fitting companion to the deranged William Cowper than is usually imagined; the boy who nearly committed suicide in his teens, who was haunted by dreams and lived in desolation and isolation for two years, was hardly likely to have been stern and unhelpful to the author of the *Castaway*.

MICHAEL HENNELL.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Michael Ramsey is Van Mildert Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham and a Canon of Durham Cathedral.

Dr Robinson is on the staff of Wells Theological College.

The Rev. Michael Hennell is Tutor of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Some parts of his article have previously appeared in *The Record*.

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 95, 96.

[2] W. T. Cairns, *John Newton: A Vindication in the Religion of Dr Johnson and Other Studies*, 1946, p. 25.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE CHURCH AND THE ATOM"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In view of the fact that the Church Assembly has not yet had the opportunity of debating this important Report, and that it would be most unfortunate if its deliberations were to be prejudiced by misleading and tendentious accounts of what it is supposed to contain, may I as a member of the Commission which prepared the Report, and as a layman who is quite unaware of having been "captured" by any "theological minority," be permitted some space to reply to some—though it can only be to some—of the virulent strictures which Dr John Robinson has felt justified in passing on the Report in your July issue?

Dr Robinson professes to be "really frightened" by what he describes as the "unrealism" involved in the "resuscitation" of the principle of the "just war." I cannot but believe that a majority of Anglicans at any rate (and it is to them that the Report is primarily addressed) would be a good deal more frightened by the rejection—whether explicit or implicit—of that doctrine which Dr Robinson appears to be light-heartedly demanding. I am unable to understand why the Commission should be supposed to be "resuscitating" a doctrine which has never, so far as I know, been repudiated by any competent authority, and is certainly assumed in the Thirty-nine Articles. What the Commission sought to do was to relate this doctrine, which involves moral limitations on the ends and the means of warfare, to a situation in which such limitations, and the discrimination required for their application, were never more urgently called for. Dr Robinson may criticize the way they have gone about their task, though his random strictures give no indication of the lines on which he would prefer that they should have proceeded; but to complain that they have not thrown up the sponge altogether and abandoned the whole problem to the dominion of the devil is, from a Christian priest, "really frightening."

Possibly Dr Robinson is a pacifist and believes that any justification for participation in warfare is impossible for Christians. If so, it would certainly be "futile" for *him* "to expect any lead from the Church of England on the subject of war," for pacifism has the support neither of Anglican tradition nor of any official authority in our Church today. This is not to say that the changing methods of warfare, and especially the conception of "total war" characteristic of a post-Christian civilization, do not call for careful scrutiny and discrimination by Christians. But this is precisely what the Commission, whose members have qualifications for the task not obviously exceeded by any which Dr Robinson reveals, has diligently attempted to provide, and its Report deserves far more precise criticism than your correspondent makes any effort to furnish.

Dr Robinson's letter is in a particular respect grossly misleading.

He complains that the Report "contrives to discuss the whole Christian attitude to war without a single reference to the New Testament or the teaching of Christ." Readers of his letter who have not read the Report and are prepared to take his word on the matter would be unlikely to gather that the section specifically headed "Morality in Warfare" is immediately preceded by twelve pages on "The Biblical Interpretation of History," which includes numerous direct references to the Scriptures and a discussion of the teaching of our Lord. This is, of course, subsumed in the section which follows, where it is not biblical exegesis but the specific issues of our present age which are under consideration. The Report closes with a section on "The Religious Task in a World of Power," a subject on which Dr Robinson gives us no hint of what, in his view, would constitute constructive leadership.

But the most scandalous paragraph in Dr Robinson's letter is that in which he accuses the Commission of casuistry, by which naked expediency is dressed up to justify what is admitted to be wrong, "and the instinct of the ordinary man" is invoked against such "hypocrisy." To refute this railing accusation would involve such lengthy quotations from the Report that I cannot expect you to allow me to pursue the matter here. I must be content to ask the "ordinary man," if any of your readers are prepared to assume this character, to say what he thinks of Dr Robinson's observations after he has studied, with the care which this complex matter demands, pages 38-54 of our Report. To say that the Commission's "application of the doctrine of necessity" is introduced to "bless for use *in any way most efficacious*" any future action of a government charged with the protection of a people from extermination is not only a monstrous distortion of the Commission's words but a charge against the probity of its members. I can only hope that your readers will require more than the wild generalizations of Dr Robinson before acquiescing in such a judgment.

Yours sincerely,

MAURICE B. RECKITT.

"A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In his article, "A New Translation of the Bible," which appears in the August issue of THEOLOGY, Dr Lowther Clarke writes: "Coming to the Old Testament, we meet the textual problem in an acute form. The dilemma is familiar. Which is better—the official Hebrew text (Massoretic), of which there are no MSS, other than scraps, older than the ninth century of our era, or the Greek version made from about 300 to 100 B.C., the oldest complete MSS of which are some 500 years earlier than the corresponding Hebrew ones?"

It should, I think, be pointed out that the entire Book of Isaiah in Hebrew on a scroll of parchment has recently been discovered and

examined by Dr Millar Burrows of Yale, who claims that it dates from the first century B.C. Dr Albright of Johns Hopkins University has stated that it is to be dated in the second century B.C. If these scholars are right in their conclusions, Dr Lowther Clarke's statement must be slightly modified, though the "dilemma" to which he refers still remains.

Yours, etc.,

H. P. SAUNDERS.

ST STEPHEN'S HOUSE, OXFORD.
August 6, 1948.

"SOME PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES OF REUNION"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Oliver Tomkins' subtle castigation of the parochial clergy in your August number cries out for an answer. Perhaps one of that lowly and, be it said, long-suffering band may be allowed to draw his attention to some points which seem to have escaped him. I am not, in the party sense, an Anglo-Catholic; I have never been an official, nor mingled in the marble halls of episcopacy, or circles "at the centre." I have also tried, in various parishes, co-operation with non-conformists on the lines which he calls "ecumenical," belonged to fraternals, and even organized United Services. I do not yelp about being the National Church—I am far prouder of being the local representative of the Church Catholic. In the hope, therefore, that I am a fairly typical specimen of the genus, may I make three observations?

(1) I must not evangelize (says Mr Tomkins), except in the "ecumenical context of unity and responsibility." It is a wonderful phrase. I suppose it means that I must occupy a platform with the local ministers and preach the Gospel with them. But then, if together we move the people to penitence, I must never mention Penance; if they desire union with our Lord, I may not tell them about the Blessed Sacrament. Baptismal regeneration, Confirmation, the Church's marriage laws, the weekly Parish Communion, to say nothing of the daily celebration or Office said in their parish church—all these must be omitted. If they ask, as they will, by whose authority I speak these things, or who gave me this authority—the doctrine of Holy Orders is taboo. I was commissioned to offer them a Cross, a Creed, and a Crown. To be truly "ecumenical" I must cushion the Cross, cancel some of the Creed, and concentrate on the Crown. The hope of glory without the means of grace! Unfortunately, I have not so learned Christ; nor do I consider that such a course reflects a true charity.

(2) "Theological seriousness" is to be the hall-mark of our discussions on unity. And yet every fraternal I have attended has left us with a hopeless sense of disharmony. The doctrines of the Church glance from almost every book of the Bible and every page of the Fathers. I was ordained "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange

doctrines contrary to God's Holy Word." But that is being "unecumenical." How does Mr Tomkins cut the Gordian knot?

(3) I may be "practising ecclesiastical dissension while the world drifts on to annihilation," but how can a parish priest regard with equanimity the capture of hordes of his little ones, baptized at the font of the Church and caught by craftiness into the web of something which, whatever it may be, is other than the Faith once for all delivered, and does not lead on to confirmation and communion? If a child of Baptist parents comes to Catechism, we send him back. And yet the majority of their Sunday-school children have godparents who made vows familiar to us all. They are not returned to us. How is our "joint responsibility to society" (*sic*) to be worked out in this context?

Mr Tomkins was a parish priest before he ascended to the rarefied strata in which he now moves. Perhaps he knows the answers. But is it any marvel if such as I wonder sometimes whether we are commissioned in an army whose leaders reflect the sentiments of the worthy Duke of Plaza-Toro?

Yours, etc.,

E. H. Levinge.

St Michael's Vicarage,
Battersea, S.W.11.

The Rev. O. S. Tomkins writes from Amsterdam:

"Unfortunately, I must try to comment upon Mr Levinge's letter without access to a copy of my own article. Otherwise I might better have been able to understand how, at every point he raises, I have given Mr Levinge the opposite impression from what I intended.

(1) *Ecumenical evangelism:* my whole point was that such evangelism must *not* suppress any conviction sincerely held by the evangelist. I cited Fr Kelly and Dr Maltby speaking at an S.C.M. conference together as a typical example. Certainly such a method raises difficulties, but only because it honestly recognizes the difficulties which Christian division has already created. On the rare occasions when it has been tried it works; but it is not often tried. I would only add that I do not think of evangelism as primarily 'occupying a platform,' but as *personal* work, though conducted by separated Christians *after* frank discussion and agreement on their strategy towards a largely paganized community.

(2) *Theological seriousness:* again my point was precisely that ecumenical discussion consists in facing *all* the reasons for 'disharmony,' but persisting in spite of them. Let us strive with all our powers 'to drive away erroneous and strange doctrines'; but, so far as our separated brothers are concerned, only serious and sustained discussion with each other will show where we really disagree. Too much time is spent in putting into each other's mouths doctrines which are not actually held.

(3) The point Mr Levinge makes about baptized children in nonconformist Sunday schools is a good example of the sort of difficulty which I was pleading should be frankly faced together by priests and ministers within a Christian fellowship with one another which is deep

and strong enough to bear it. 'Fraternals' of such depth and strength of Christian fellowship are rare.

I am deeply sorry if I appeared to be 'castigating' the parochial clergy, even if subtly, for I am one of them, doing a temporary, specialized job. My whole object was, and is, to plead for their co-operation in the ecumenical movement at the point, above all others, at which its fate will be decided."

"WHAT IS ANGLICANISM?"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Would it be an undue simplification to answer the question "What is Anglicanism?" in these words: *Anglicanism is undifferentiated Catholicism*? Surely ours is the only form of Christianity which obeys quite literally the dominical injunction "Call no man your father on the earth, for one is your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. xxiii, 8-10), and the Pauline warning against saying "I am of Paul" and "I of Apollos" (1 Cor. i, 11-14). We have no human Rabbi, Father or Master. The Methodists have John Wesley; the Lutherans, Martin Luther; the Calvinists, John Calvin; the Roman Catholics, St Thomas Aquinas. We have nothing equivalent to them. We are not Cranmerians, nor Hookerians, nor Taylorians. We are just undifferentiated Catholics.

It is this undifferentiated Catholicism that makes for our flexibility and variety, which, while adhering to the fundamentals of Catholicism, makes Anglicanism at home in every land to which our missionaries have brought it.

We fulfil that ideal of the Church described by St Augustine: " 'The Queen in a vesture of gold clothed about with divers colours.' . . . It is the mysteries of doctrine in all divers tongues; one African, one Syrian, one Greek, one Hebrew, one this, one that. . . . In that vesture let there be diversity, but let there be no rent" (*Homily on Ps. xlv*).

Here is a claim, simple and clear, with which we can face the world: *Undifferentiated Catholicism.*

Yours, etc.,
CLAUDE CHAVASSE.

KIDLINGTON, OXFORD.
August 10, 1948.

"SHALIACH"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am indebted to Mr Hart for explaining so clearly the complicated blunders into which I had fallen over 3 Bas. xiv, 6, of which I had already partly become aware. I am and shall be for some weeks away from books of reference, but I have no doubt that he is correct

in all his seven footnotes. I am no Hebraist, and I was forced by outside engagements to complete the article in four days from start to finish, without being able to submit my stumbling efforts to others better equipped than myself in this respect. This may explain but cannot excuse my blunders, for which I offer my sincere apologies to yourself and your readers.

But the error cuts rather deeper into the argument than Mr Hart's modest "footnotes on certain minor points" might suggest. Mr Hart takes it for granted (as I did) that 3 Bas. xiv, 6 comes from the true text of LXX, the Alexandrian version. But another scholar suggests to me that this whole *pericope* as it is printed in the Greek O.T. comes from the version of Aquila, in the earlier second century A.D.

Again I have had no opportunity of verifying the facts, but candour obliges me to put the suggestion forward. For if this is so, we should have no actual instance of a Jewish usage of the word *ἀπόστολος* itself before that date. We could still argue from the existence of pre-Christian *shelihim* among the Jews and the undoubted equivalence of *shālach*=*ἀποστέλλειν* in LXX. It would remain extremely improbable that the Jews accepted the title *ἀπόστολος* for their official *shelihim* as a novelty after the appearance of the Christian "Apostles." But the discussion would probably begin most usefully from St Paul's references to *τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους* in Gal. i, 17 and the appearance *τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν* in 1 Cor. xv, 7.

Dr Hunkin has correctly observed that there was a misprint of "p. 46" for "p. 48" in one of my references to Lake's note; but he again misunderstands *Berakôth*, v, 5. It runs: "He who is praying and makes a mistake—it is a bad omen for him. And if he is the *shaliach zibbur* (let us say: 'agent of the congregation') it is a bad omen for those that bade him represent them, because a man's *shaliach* is like himself." He may be only the "precentor"—but even in this quaint instance the *shaliach* commits his principals, even against their will. His action has unavoidable consequences for them. That is the nature of the *shaliach's* commission.

I am, Sir,
Your servant in Dño,
GREGORY DIX, O.S.B.

AT THE CONVENT OF THE TRANSFIGURATION,
WINGRAVE, BUCKS.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE MISSION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION. Edited by E. R. Morgan and Roger Lloyd. S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. 10s. 6d.

The theme of this volume of essays, to which no less than nineteen writers besides the editors have contributed, is well expressed in a phrase in the Bishop of Southampton's essay—"the Body of Christ, an organic fellowship compacted of that which every joint supplies, rich in worship, in the morality of grace, in the hospitality of giving and receiving." This note is struck in Mr Norman Blow's opening essay, which presents Père Charles's theology of missions. According to that theology, the work of missions is not to be identified with the work of

converting everybody everywhere, but is specifically "the planting of the visible Church in all its completeness in areas where it either has never existed or has now ceased to exist."

The theme recurs in the subsequent essays, in which Père Charles's definition is seen being worked out in the life of the Anglican Communion. Thus the Bishop of Southampton relates the theme to secular society, preferring in the process a biological to a legal interpretation of natural law. Canon Lloyd asks how in fact the Church has grown and spread in history, and finds the answer, not in carefully prepared schemes of evangelism, but in spontaneity. Canon Addleshaw traces the growth of the Law and Constitution of the Anglican Communion overseas in a masterly essay that brings together much historical information not easily accessible elsewhere. Mr Oliver Tomkins writes with pungency of the place of Anglicanism in the Ecumenical Movement, and Canon France discusses with great insight the place of missionary societies in the Church in coming days.

The second part of the book is entitled "Giving and Receiving," and reveals how much the younger churches, now growing to maturity, have to give to the fullness of the life of the Anglican Communion, as well as how much they still need to receive. Bantu conceptions of the community can enrich our understanding of the Church as the Body of Christ. Loyalty, freely given by bishop, priest and layman alike to decisions synodically arrived at in India, rebukes the prelacy and lawlessness of the Church of England. Africa, India and China all have much to contribute to the full understanding of Christian conduct. They have, too, gifts of art to bring to the City of God. And between the various branches of the Anglican family there must be deep fellowship, exemplified in the identification of the missionary with the life of the Church in which he serves and in the readiness of the insular Englishman overseas to join in Anglican worship, even though it be in other forms and another language than that which he has known in his parish church at home.

Naturally with such an array of writers differences are bound to appear. Few writers keep strictly to Père Charles's definition of the work of missions. Canon France and Miss Martindale come to opposite conclusions on the control of missionary stipends. Canon Broomfield's frank declaration that "the tribal organization of African society cannot be preserved" reflects an outlook apparently more recent than that of the other writers about Africa. Nevertheless, underlying the differences there is a deep unity. Running through the book is the constant theme of the rich variety of the Church's corporate life, into which the many races and cultures of the world are bringing their separate heritages. The door, however, is firmly closed to syncretism. "Pagan Africa," says Fr Russell—and the same is true of other lands—"must be baptized into the Church, and Baptism is no mere sprinkling with Holy Water, but involves dying and rising with Christ."

The book should surely have included an essay on the meaning of Anglicanism. Mr Sambayya's article is a moving *confessio fidei*, but the book needs something as authoritative on the theological side as Canon Addleshaw's essay is on the constitutional. The omission of an

article on the mission of the Anglican Communion in the field of reunion is also surprising. For the problem is urgent, and the fundamental question goes much deeper than the pros and cons of any particular scheme of reunion. Are we to stall at the last minute in any reunion negotiations in the hope that somehow, some time, Rome will come in too? Must we recognise regretfully that the world situation may well demand action without waiting for the forces of authoritarian non-co-operation?

The arrangement of the essays would also have been better if Part I had been confined to the fundamentals of Anglicanism and the theology of missions and headed "Principles"; if Part II had included Bishop Yashiro's illuminating record of the wartime sufferings of the Japanese Church; and the remainder of the essays had been grouped in a new Part III under some such title as "Lines of Development."

One is nevertheless grateful for a stimulating volume which cannot but enlarge the vision of all concerned with the world-wide life of the Anglican Communion.

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

Scholæ Cancellarii,
Lincoln.

The Sacred and the Secular. An enquiry into the principles of a Christian civilization; being the Bampton Lectures for 1946. By P. A. Micklem. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

The Church's Encounter with Civilization; being the William Ainslie Memorial Lecture. By E. H. Burgmann. Longmans. 2s.

Dr Micklem's Bampton Lectures are an important and valuable contribution to the discussion of the Church's relation to the problem of modern secularism. From a background of wide historical knowledge and acute historical perception, and with a realistic grasp of modern social conditions, they sketch the process whereby our Western civilization has, broadly speaking, cut itself adrift from any effective control by the sacred, the transcendent, the other-wordly, thus depriving itself of absolute sanctions and the sense of absolute values, and as a consequence finding itself threatened with collapse and downfall. And they offer a Christian interpretation of civilization based on the doctrine of the Incarnation wherein the two realms, the sacred and the secular, are related in such a way that the supremacy and sovereignty of the former is the condition of the fulfilment of the true ends of the latter, and the guardian of its autonomy within its own sphere. The lecturer's plea is that the urgent call to the Church today is to point the way to a new integration and synthesis of these two realms in terms of our modern conditions; and in his closing lecture he makes certain practical proposals to that end.

In his historical survey the lecturer draws attention to the fact that the Græco-Roman world into which Christianity came was a one-way level of life in which the sacred, though it certainly existed as idea, and expressed itself in religious forms, played no effective part in limiting and controlling the autonomy of secular life in the polis and

the state, but contented itself with providing satisfactions for men's inner desires and aspirations. Hence the profound disturbance and tension which Christianity brought, and the bitter hostility which it evoked. Christianity nevertheless conquered, for this one-way level proved impotent in the long run not only to meet men's deepest needs, but also to hold permanently in check the wild anarchic forces of his unregenerate nature through its lack of absolute standards and values. A brilliant, though necessarily temporary, synthesis between the sacred and the secular was effected in medieval Catholicism, where the law of Christ as interpreted by the Church, and made effective in the universal jurisdiction of the Pope, regulated and subordinated to itself every sphere of life and activity. This synthesis, though it seems to capture Dr Micklem's imagination, was however, as he himself confesses, less a genuine synthesis than an absorption of the secular by the sacred. The inherent vitalities which belong to man's this-worldly existence, and which the medieval Church had striven to suppress, broke out into dominant expression in the Renaissance. The Renaissance movement not only claimed freedom for man's mental and spiritual life, but gave an impetus to the growing sense of independent and sovereign nationality, and provided sanctions for a new economic order which revolted against any restraints on its own inherent capacity for expansion. Neither the Reformation nor the Counter-Reformation proved capable of arresting the drive towards the sole supremacy of the secular thus initiated, for reasons which the lecturer acutely appraises. The post-Renaissance period has witnessed an ever-widening gap between the two spheres; and in our modern days one term of the synthesis, the sacred, has largely dropped out.

In estimating the prospects of a new integration, the lecturer repudiates any deterministic view of history, and lays emphasis on the possibilities of the human will and endeavour. He stresses the importance of the Church and looks forward to a revival of her spiritual life. He insists that a diffused Christianity is not enough; what is wanted is a community which shall manifest in a corporate way the order of life which springs from the Incarnation. He is thus led to discuss the relation between Church and State, criticizing the Concordat basis of this relation, and commending, though with reserve, the principle of Establishment as it exists in this country. For the renewal of the Church's life within the framework of the modern world, he suggests three things. First, an inner group of those who will withdraw themselves from all secular activities, and individually or collectively set themselves to the pursuit of supernatural holiness: second, the formation of "cells" which will regulate their common life exclusively by the law of Christ: and third, an apostolate of the laity who will go forth into the common ways of the world bearing witness by life and word to the ultimate sanctions and values of the Christian Gospel. These three desiderata, as they are fulfilled, will lead to a revivifying of worship on the part of the Church in general; a worship which must centre in and radiate from the altar where man's life in its wholeness is offered up for consecration through its unity with the divine humanity of Christ.

The criticism which we are disposed to make of Dr Micklem's thesis is, to put it bluntly, that it fails to take adequate account of the sinfulness of sin. What we miss in his book is sufficient stress laid upon the portentous fact, that bound up with, and springing out of, modern secularism is planned, organized and determined wickedness of such a kind and on such a scale as the world has probably never known before. This wickedness, and the secularism bound up with it, cannot be met by mere attempts on the part of the Church in the direction of a new synthesis of two realms or orders of existence. The practical proposals which Dr Micklem makes savour rather too much of an attempt to save the world by exhibiting before it the holy man and the holy group. What is needed is clearer and firmer witness to the reality of the Holy God. We feel that Dr Micklem's thought moves rather too preponderantly in the incarnational and sacramental dimension, and is somewhat lacking in that dynamic accent which belongs to the biblical word of judgment and redemption.

The William Ainslie Lecture recently delivered by Bishop Burgmann of New South Wales may be read as a commentary on and perhaps, in some senses, a corrective to Dr Micklem's book. It emphasizes a little more decisively than the latter the reconciling and new creating action of Christ in His Gospel, and the element of personal encounter belonging to that action. The lecturer introduces his theme with a vivid account of the deadly effects of Western civilization on the aborigines of Australia, and makes the assertion that "there is high tension and hard encounter between the Christian faith and any form of civilization." There is much that is thought-provoking and much that is inspiring in the lecture.

F. W. Camfield.

Kingsbridge.

Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion. By Atkinson Lee. Duckworth. 6s.

The professed aim of the writer of this book is to lay a groundwork, a basic plan, to sort out the accumulation of material dealing with religion that has gathered in the current century.

In this he is reasonably successful. With such an aim, broad general conclusions, such as would have ensured easier reading, can hardly be expected. Their absence means that the work inevitably retains something of its original character, a compilation of notes and reflections for use in the lecture room. But the writer is so full of his subject, so much at home in the realms of philosophy and of religion, that his work does far more than enable the student "to pursue his studies further."

In the first part of the book there is an attempt to ascertain, along empirical lines, the nature of religion. This section gives one an impression of originality and freshness not noticeably characteristic of the other two. Mr Lee examines, all too briefly, Schleiermacher's account of religion as a feeling of absolute dependence. He reproduces Pfleiderer's criticism of this and his conclusion that "not mere depend-

ence which excludes all freedom, but rather freedom in dependence upon God, is religion."

One may regret perhaps that the writer does not enlarge on this fine phrase, especially as he leaves one to conclude, by his use of the suggestive Pauline parallel "When I am weak, then I am strong," that he has plenty of material in reserve. A similar regret is felt by one reader at least at Mr Lee's brief dismissal of the notion of religion as gratitude. Gratitude, which appears to be common to both natural and Christian piety, is rightly said to be a complex emotion. I am somewhat doubtful of its analysis into "tenderness and self-abasement," and more than doubtful of the compliment paid to the well-known saying in the Westminster Catechism that the chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever. It has always seemed to me that the second half of this sentence contains the unfortunate suggestion that the ultimate aim of man is a selfish one, that his final *raison d'être* is to obtain something for himself. However, I must add that Mr Lee deals very well with Schleiermacher and with Otto, though again all too briefly with the latter. He rightly says that the elemental religious situation may be defined as "piety in the presence of the holy." What I do not find in Mr Lee's book is the obvious criticism of all "numinous" accounts of religion that they leave unexplained the invariable concomitance, at least at the higher levels, of morality and reason with the religious attitude.

The final chapter of Part One is one of the best in the whole book, and, as its title "The Relations of Religion to Culture and Civilization" suggests, it might be expanded (perhaps it will?) into a whole volume.

I am sure that Mr Lee is right in saying that the endeavour to abolish rewards and punishments is utopian when it is not antinomian, that the very possibility of coherent conduct at all implies religious sanctions, and that moral theory eventually passes over into a pragmatic theology, which when thought out becomes metaphysical. Further, I believe that all these need saying today. But they need much fuller vindication than is given to them in Mr Lee's book.

It is only fair to add that in a book where so much is attempted there is bound to be a fair number of conclusions unaccompanied by the premisses they require.

In Part Two the writer describes the phases of religion as it has historically developed, beginning with primitive religion and ending with mysticism; the treatment of the latter, if brief, is excellent.

In Part Three the different types of religious philosophy are passed under review. This is quite well done, though occasionally Mr Lee needlessly adopts new-fangled phraseology—*e.g.*, when speaking of the well-known belief in deification, which persists in the Eastern Churches, he uses the ugly substitute "divinization."

In conclusion, it may be said that this is a useful book, full of suggestions for detailed study, and that it deserves a wider public than that composed of students of philosophy and of theology.

R. R. Hartford.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR FESTIVAL. By Norman H. Snaith. S.P.C.K. 13s. 6d.

The Tutor in Old Testament Languages and Literature at Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds, has already earned the gratitude of students of the Old Testament by his critical investigation, in *Studies in the Psalter* (1934), of Mowinckel's theory of a pre-exilic annual New Year Coronation Feast of Yahweh, after the Babylonian pattern, at which the so-called Coronation Psalms (xlvii, xciii, xcv-c) were used in the Temple liturgy. In his earlier book Mr Snaith rejected this theory and showed that the "Coronation Psalms" are to be regarded as post-exilic Sabbath psalms. He has now given us a full-length study of the origins and development of the New Year Festival itself.

In opposition to Volz, Mowinckel and others of their school, the author holds that the association of the Kingdom of God with the Jewish New Year Festival (Rosh hashShanah) did not begin until the late first or early second century A.D., during the troubles of the wars with Rome. He accepts the view of L. Ginsberg and Finkelstein that the Malkiyyoth of the synagogue liturgy were inserted in the prayers for Rosh hashShanah in the time of R. Aqiba, when they were added to the earlier Zikhronoth and Shopharoth. Thus the connexion between Rosh hashShanah and the Kingdom of God cannot be used as evidence of any connexion between Rosh hashShanah and any King-festival after the Babylonian pattern. The Israelitish cults of pre-exilic days probably followed rather the agricultural pattern of the Ras Shamra texts, and not the highly developed urbanized cults of the cities of Mesopotamia.

Mr Snaith, therefore, argues that the Jewish New Year goes back to a pre-exilic autumn Harvest Festival. Before the Exile the year ended with the full moon after the vintage, which in Jerusalem was the harvest moon. Similarly the pre-exilic month began with the full moon, and not with the new moon, as has generally been supposed: the word *chodesh* then meant "new month day," *i.e.* full moon day. It was the Sabbath that was the new moon day—the day which marked the end of the first half of the lunar month.

During and after the Exile there was almost a complete break with the earlier cults. It is impossible here even to outline the detailed and sustained argument with which Mr Snaith traces the changes in the calendar which then took place, and the development of the Sabbath as a seven-day-week festival. The final stage with regard to the New Year was reached with the emergence of three festivals out of the original Feast of Ingathering. "First there is that New Year's Day which kept close to the moon and was ultimately called Tishri 15. Next there is the curious New Year's Day, Tishri 10, surviving in its association with the Year of Jubilee, the 'Old New Year's Day.' Lastly, so far as the ecclesiastical calendar is concerned, there is the true ecclesiastical New Year's Day, Tishri 1, later known as Rosh hash-Shanah" (p. 148). This latter day, Tishri 1, became the pre-eminent new-month day in the Priestly Code which made it into "a solemn rest, a memorial of trumpet-blowing, a holy assembly" (Lev. xxiii, 24). During the troubled period of the Roman wars there was a fresh

turning of men's minds to the Kingship of God and the hope of the world to come. Thus the festival of the first day of the Jewish Ecclesiastical Year became the Festival of Yahweh the King.

This is a book of profound scholarship, which will have to be reckoned with by all future writers on the subject. It throws a flood of light on the evolution of the Hebrew calendar and liturgy, and will do much to redress the balance between the development of the Hebrew cultus *per se* and the part played in that development by the myth-ritual pattern of the Ancient East.

C. W. Dugmore.
Manchester University.

The Regal Power of the Church. The Fundamentals of the Canon Law. By the late E. G. Wood, with a preface by E. W. Kemp. Dacre Press. 4s. 6d.

E. G. Wood, vicar of St Clement's, Cambridge, from 1885 to 1931, died in 1932 at the age of ninety-one. The mention of his name to Cambridge men still acts like smoke upon bees on the comb: it sends them dipping into a store of the legendary and fabulous, and makes them as jolly companions as one could wish for. His book on the fundamentals of the canon law was written in 1887 to encourage others to undertake the study; Mr Kemp has republished it, with a new preface and bibliography, to assist those who may be moved by the recent Canon Law Report to revive the study in the theological colleges. We came to this book as enthusiastic as any for this revival; we rise from it hesitant, uncertain whether it is either possible or to be desired. The study of the Canon Law Report is easy, and ordinands might reasonably be obliged to undertake it; it provides and justifies a necessary part of their professional equipment. But the study of *canon law*, as E. G. Wood has presented it, is a venture into a specialized realm of theology which, in the days when the science was alive, no student was ever expected or competent to make without the long preparation of *trivium* and *quadrivium* in his university; and for this no graduate training today provides an adequate substitute. Wood's authorities stand almost all within the unbroken Roman tradition; he draws as much from the Tridentine and later continentals as from the Fathers and the classical medievals. The syllogistic method they employ runs through their whole theology, their canonical jurisprudence is consonant with their entire system. With contemporary life and theology in the Church of England it is not. And we look at this massive intellectual edifice through the window of Wood's unchallenged scholarship and erudition, and doubt whether we ought to try again to make it so. Our departure from that tradition has created a new historical situation; we hesitate to concede that to "revive" or "recapture" is the way to meet it. Frederick Temple wrote in 1857: "Our theology has been cast in the scholastic mode, *i.e.* all based on Logic. We are in need of and we are being gradually forced into a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain; but nothing can prevent it." We insist neither

on Temple's absolute antithesis nor on his new category; but we urge that a new bottle deserves new wine.

Be it observed that we do not criticize this work *because* its sources are Roman Catholic, even less because some are papal—Wood favoured the Gallicans when he could get them, every time. We do not criticize it as an exposition, for it is a piece of high scholarship: the section on the Governors and the Governed is especially valuable. But we do question whether what it expounds is a necessary or indeed a proper study for English ordinands and parish priests, just as many questioned the value and propriety of Dr Pusey's editions of continental books of devotion. Perhaps correspondents can give an answer.

That E. G. Wood had no suspicion of the difficulty we have raised is evident from the section headed Preliminary. He has to give a divine warrant for the *jus canonicum* of the Church, and he does it by pressing the Kingdom metaphor to the exclusion of others, and in this he calls Sir John Seeley and Dr Liddon to his aid. Now the reference to *Ecce Homo* will have been worth while if it recalls that book from its present oblivion—Gladstone was accused of neglecting his public duties for it in 1865; our younger theological tutors now return a polite negative—but the passages quoted by Wood are selected arbitrarily to support an ideal of *imperium* with which the book as a whole has little affinity. Much turns on the use and limits of words—*e.g.* authority, Kingdom, Commonwealth, Republic—and this is not the place to argue them; but there is a difference in kind between Seeley's "image of a commonwealth in which a universal enthusiasm . . . takes the place of law" (4th ed., p. 191) and the Church of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*; and this difference is not reconciled by Wood's adroitly dissociating "the sacred jurisprudence of the Church" from its more disreputable practitioners. Seeley might indeed be transcribed "as a first prolegomenon to a treatise on canon law," but as much for the unrealized and "ideal" aspects of the Kingdom which he represents as for the visible, formal and institutional which fascinate the canonist. And he has a useful aside upon hoping "to restore the precise institutions under which the nation had prospered long before" (p. 22). Wood's pages (9-11) upon the relation of the canon law to the common law of England (here called *more Romano*, the "municipal" law) are surely among those which Mr Kemp suggests would now have been revised. The statement that "practically the canonists were the only lawyers in the realm" is untrue of any time after the opening of the thirteenth century and misleading of any time before. Had Mr Kemp undertaken, as he might without immodesty, such a revision or annotation of the book, we should have stood even further in his debt.

HAWARDEN. G. R. DUNSTAN.

NOTES ON EPISCOPAL ORNAMENTS AND CEREMONIAL. By Francis C. Eeles. Alcuin Club Tracts XXV. A. R. Mowbray and Co. for the Alcuin Club. 3s. 6d.

This little book is intended to perform for bishops some part of the functions which the late Dr Percy Dearmer's *Parson's Handbook* was

designed to perform for parish clergymen. Like Dr Dearmer, Dr Eeles is offended by Roman ceremonial and its "mass of minutiæ," and prefers "the broader and more striking enrichments one finds in medieval or Gallican usage." He presents here some account of episcopal vesture and ornament, together with a number of ceremonial directions which an Anglican bishop, who is at a loss how to proceed congruously with such of the pre-Reformation vesture and ornament as he may have adopted, can reasonably perform without incurring a charge of imitating foreign procedure.

The notes on ceremonial provide guidance concerning the occasions upon which the different kinds of vestment should be worn, the moments at which the mitre should be put on and put off, when and how to hold the crozier, and when to sit or stand. With the exception of the consecration of churches and altars, the services considered by Dr Eeles are those of the Prayer Book. Dr Eeles describes his notes as "somewhat disconnected." At certain points this description is well enough founded for a bishop lacking liturgical sense to be left without direction when he needs it. At an ordination, for instance, when he has handed his crozier to his chaplain and removed his mitre, should he stand or kneel for *Veni Creator* "and the following prayer" (*i.e.* the equivalent of the ancient Ordination Prayer)? Should he turn towards, or away from, the *ordinandi*? Dr Eeles omits to inform him. Elsewhere, on the other hand, we have an explicitness which may surprise. It is "obviously undesirable" to confirm candidates as they kneel before the altar rail; but a bishop "may confirm two candidates together to save time."

The notes on episcopal ornament are mainly historical. Though interesting, they are few and incomplete; and the reader will wish for more. Upon the authority of Dr C. A. H. Franklyn (whose learned article on academic dress may be read in *Oxford*, Winter, 1946-7, pp. 78 *ff.*), it could have been said that the chimere is certainly, not merely "possibly," of academic origin. It might have been said also that the English bishop's black scarf is the doctor's scarf; and it would not have been inappropriate to recommend that bishops who are doctors should return to wearing the doctor's black cap instead of that now fashionable adaptation of the continental bishop's purple biretta, the violet velvet "Canterbury," which is incongruous alike with doctor's scarlet and with black. Ecclesiastical antiquarians will appreciate Dr Eeles' account, and directions for use, of the crozier. Dr Frere (as Dr Eeles recalls) had history behind him when he wrote: "I think it is clear that the pastoral staff is a part of the ornaments of a bishop as bishop . . . it is not a matter of jurisdiction." Similarly, Dr Eeles has history behind him when he assumes that archbishops will have, and carry, croziers. Though there is medieval Scottish precedent for an archbishop to hold his cross as he blesses the people, the cross is not an archiepiscopal substitute for the pastoral staff.

In conclusion, it may be permitted to express a hope that this little book will become the foundation of a larger work, or of two larger works, in which the origin and historical development of episcopal vesture and ornament will be fully treated with references and illus-

trations, and the problems of episcopal ceremonial be reconsidered against the broader and simpler background of the "pre-mitre," or pre-medieval, period.

E. C. Ratcliff.

Ely.

The Heart of the Matter. By Graham Greene. Heinemann. 9s. 6d.

From the opening scene, in which the bells are heard ringing for mass, to the closing words of the priest pronouncing an epitaph on the hero, or central figure, this novel is concerned with sin, blasphemy, and damnation. The author has clearly intended, and far more than in any of the earlier works with which he has acquired an honoured name in English letters, to produce a story of religious problems and of some effects of the Christian faith on believers. On that account the book should be recommended to readers of this periodical, if only as a curiosity.

For today at any rate the religious novel—if I may call it that—is in England a rarity. It is true that Mr Greene is not the only English Roman Catholic engaged in writing fiction. There is also, for instance, Mr Evelyn Waugh, who not long ago was responsible for the novel entitled *Brideshead Revisited*. But compared with France in the same line, England has little to show. In France the production of novels on religious themes is, if not quite an industry, at least sufficiently large for the products to be accepted without undue excitement. Their authors enjoy large sales and the concomitant rewards of literary success. But they are taken for granted. As a corollary their work has that finish which may follow on ample practice. When a year or so back there was published the English translation of a novel by my friend Daniel-Rops, an unjust reviewer declared that it was *Brideshead Revisited* written by an adult.

Daniel-Rops is the author of the supreme best-seller in France, *Jésus Christ en son Temps*, but among his own countrymen his novels enjoy a more moderate favour. The two most noted French exponents of the art of the religious novel are of course François Mauriac and the late Georges Bernanos. Mauriac belongs to the French Academy; Bernanos was almost an Ishmaelite; and that is not the only difference between them. What distinguishes them significantly is the character of their respective visions.

Of this gulf the French themselves are hardly aware. But Mr Karl Epting, who was in charge of the German Franco-German Institute in Paris during the occupation of France, was sharply conscious of it. According to him, in the novels of Mauriac the characters are hunted through all the sins of the flesh—with a predilection for heroines, because in women carnal sin can be endowed with sensual fascination—and then in the end the characters are redeemed. That is all. There is no hint of a twofold struggle being waged between God and man and between God and Satan, a twofold struggle for souls. But in the novels of Bernanos—again according to Mr Epting—it is not the body

only, it is the soul too that sins, and the dramatic tension quickens salvation and perdition into urgent realities.

It should be an exercise as entertaining and instructive to read *The Heart of the Matter* with a view to deciding whether Mr Greene stands forth in it as a disciple of Mauriac or as a disciple of Bernanos, or whether he has somehow contrived to follow in the footsteps of both.

PETERBOROUGH. MONTGOMERY BELGION.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Church and the Churches. By K. L. Carrick Smith. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

So great is the present spate of books on Church unity and Christian reunion that an author must have something very direct and original to say to justify the publication of his book. Miss Carrick Smith, while her book is neither direct nor original, has, however, justified her publication by bringing forward a point of view which at the moment is being swamped in ecumenical rivers. She believes that so great is the value of the distinctiveness of the various Christian divisions that a union of faith and order would be positively harmful.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first the author is concerned with individual Christians and the different ways in which they approach religious truth, and in the second part she is concerned with churches and denominations in England. In a final, brief chapter she expresses her belief that unity in Christ consists of all Christians, of whatever church or none, showing love one towards another.

I am afraid the book does not "come off." Miss Carrick Smith is most happy in dealing with the various Christian divisions, and her chapter on the Society of Friends is particularly good. If a case needed to be made as to the distinctive values of the denominations, she has made it. But such a case does not need to be made; it is a commonplace of ecumenical thought and action that that which is of true value in each Christian tradition must be conserved when God's people come together again and, further, that the value of the individual in the field of reunion work is gravely impaired if he be not himself rooted and grounded in his own tradition. But at this stage of Christian thought and history it requires a very strong theological justification to urge that because certain valuable elements are at present held in isolation they should therefore continue to be so, with an added cloak of Christian charity thrown over the whole. The theological justification offered in the present book is inadequate. In the final chapter Miss Carrick Smith appears to make her conclusions hang upon a single text from the Fourth Gospel—"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another"—on the strength of which she makes the highly debatable statement that "Jesus Himself recognized no other sign of belonging to Him than mutual love." Further comment appears unnecessary.

NORTHOLT PARK. HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

The Size of Life. By J. P. Murphy. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

The sub-title of this Roman Catholic book is more illuminating than the title—"A Religious Speculation, setting out the Relation of all Man's Activities in their True Perspective and Proportion." Readers who form an unfavourable impression from the early pages should persevere. The short first chapter contains obscurities of style and some unconvincing arguments, but the rest of the book is well written. The early themes are the relative importance of spirit as against matter, and of moral goodness as against talent, achievement and "greatness." There can be no great man without moral goodness.

Chapter three then considers the true relations between physical sciences, dealing with matter, and the "metaphysical," dealing with spirit. Whereas the former yield only theories and probabilities, the latter, it is claimed, give certainty. Natural theology "demonstrates" the existence of God and its implications (the Thomist claim). Theology can further establish exactly what things God has revealed, and so can declare with certainty the purpose of human life. These things thus settled, all other sciences fall into their rightful places. But the denial of theology's supremacy is having increasingly disastrous results for education, morals and society, which are vividly portrayed. A stimulating chapter.

The second half of the book seeks to justify these claims made for theology. Everything hinges on the Incarnation. There is no difficulty in showing that our Lord claimed to be God Incarnate (here the author relies largely on the Fourth Gospel); and He made good His claim—the "aut deus aut homo non bonus" argument is fully presented; so is the argument from miracle. Here, then, is certain revelation. But how bring the revelation home to ourselves and make it a living reality? By finding and belonging to what Christ called His Church. Then follows a long section—longer than the balance of the book requires—seeking to show that the Roman Church alone is the true Church of Christ, alone giving certainty in doctrine and morals.

DUNTON BASSETT. F. H. ALLEN.

The Beatitudes. By George Seaver. S.P.C.K. 2s.

One has learnt to expect from George Seaver, the biographer of Schweitzer, a thoughtfulness and a serenity none too common in devotional writing in our days. At a time when the world is fevered and every kind of fanaticism is rampant, we need to return afresh to a study of the Beatitudes. Dr Seaver tells the story of a great Indian—it must surely have been Gandhi—who rose to address a multitude of his adherents to hear a message of grave political moment and, quoting the Beatitudes, sat down, adding only, "I have nothing else to say." The secret of Gandhi's power was that he tried literally to live after the fashion of the Beatitudes and even when in conflict not to lose that spirit.

One may be allowed to question Dr Seaver's interpretation at points—*e.g.*, is the essence of the first Beatitude humility, or rather

detachment? Does it refer purely to an inward attitude? Again, is the Greek rendered "meek" best interpreted as "modest"? Du Bose suggests "good at teamwork with others." It has something of the sense of flexible, co-operative, amenable, or even open-minded. These are details, but this little pamphlet is of great value and would provide a wholesome basis for meditation.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

SHEFFIELD.

The Kingship of Christ. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M. Press. 4s.

This book is about the revival of biblical theology among continental Protestants, and its implications for Church and world. It describes how pietism, with its insufficient emphasis on Christ's kingship over the world, and Liberal Protestantism, which made Christ no king at all but a mere teacher of ideals, had become dominant, and how they failed to resist the storm of Nazism. But the Barthians began the return to biblical theology. They supplied, just in time, the theological basis for the Church's struggle against the Nazis, and for the courageous proclamations that not only Church life, but also the actions of the State, ought to be obedient to the law of Christ alone. Yet this new outlook has won no assured victory within the Church, but pietism and Liberal Protestantism remain a great danger.

The New Testament doctrine of Christ's kingship is well outlined. Christ's early followers confessed Him as Lord, seated at the right hand of God. He proclaimed that in His ministry the kingdom of God had come, and that He had overcome the world. Yet the New Testament also often speaks of a further and final victory in the future, when He shall have "put all His enemies under His feet." Our author describes the Church as an "advance guard" of this final victory, and an instrument for its accomplishment. One could perhaps have desired a clearer statement as to where or when this final victory is to be, whether in heaven or on earth.

There is a grave warning in the description of the weakening and secularizing of the Church, which has resulted from the neglect of biblical theology, and from regarding Christ as something other than king. "At the present moment the realities of Church life are a denial of the message that Christ is king."

F. H. ALLEN.

DUNTON BASSETT.

Christian Pamphlets. Recommended List—I. Advisory Committee on Christian Pamphlets, 19, Fitzroy Square, London, W.1. 6d.

This is a list of pamphlets that are in print, with a concise note on each. The committee that has prepared it has taken care to recommend only such pamphlets as are attractive, both in format and in style. The list should prove of great value to those who are responsible for stocking tract cases in churches. Further lists will be issued from time to time.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

A.P.R.: *The General List of Retreats* (1s. 6d. per annum).

Blackfriars Publications: Ferdinand Valentine, O.P., *Reading between the Lines* (The Third Theophila Correspondence) (6s.).

Blackwell: A. C. Headlam, *The Fourth Gospel as History* (7s. 6d.).

Geoffrey Bles: Vladimir Solovyev, *Russia and the Universal Church* (15s.).

Bowes and Bowes: R. F. McNeile, *Christianity in Southern Fenland* (12s. 6d.).

Burns Oates: A Poor Clare, *A Simple Way of Love* (6s.).

Church Book Room Press: *The Office of a Bishop* (1s. 6d.); *Evangelicals Affirm* (6s.); J. P. Hickinbotham, *Conditions of Fellowship* (3s. 6d.).

Dacre Press: Dom Gregory Dix, *Dixit Cranmer et non timuit* (reprinted from *The Church Quarterly Review*) (2s.).

Epworth Press: L. F. Church, *The Early Methodist People* (12s. 6d.).

Faber and Faber: Warner Allen, *The Happy Issue* (12s. 6d.).

Hodder and Stoughton: T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (6s.).

Independent Press: C. E. Surman, *As Silver is Tried* (4s.); H. Bickley, *The High Calling and Work of a Deacon* (4d.); L. E. Cooke, *The Prophetic Ministry of the Church* (6d.); Leyton Richards, *Christian Pacifism after Two World Wars* (7s. 6d.).

Jason Press: J. Middleton Murry, *The Challenge of Schweitzer* (6s.).

Lutterworth Press: F. W. Dillistone, *Revelation and Evangelism* (7s. 6d.); T. H. Croxall, *Kierkegaard Studies* (15s.); C. Gray, *The Epistles of St Paul to the Colossians and Philemon* (5s.); E. C. Rust, *The Christian Understanding of History* (17s. 6d.); H. S. Leiper (Ed.), *Christianity To-day* (25s.).

Mowbrays: J. H. Ward, *Sunday Morning* (Outline Sermons on the Old Testament) (3s.); S. L. Ollard, G. Crosse and M. F. Bond, *A Dictionary of English Church History* (3rd edn.) (25s.).

John Murray: R. G. Coulson, *The Way into God* (7s. 6d.).

Oxford University Press: F. A. Iremonger, *William Temple* (25s.).

Pax House: Michael Bruce, *The News before the News* (1s. 3d.).

Press and Publications Board: C. M. Ady, *The Role of Women in the Church* (7s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: Ruth Rouse, *The World's Student Christian Federation* (12s. 6d.); M. Jarrett-Kerr, C.R., *Our Trespasses* (6s.); Bishop E. J. Palmer, *Protestant and Catholic* (1s.).

Sheed and Ward: Dom Hubert van Zeller, *We Die Standing Up* (7s. 6d.).

Silurian Books (Llandebie, Carms.): Ewart Lewis, *The Church in Wales, the Catholic Faith and the Future* (2s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: *Artificial Human Insemination* (2s. 6d.); K. G. Packard, *Thoughts on the Parish System* (3d.); Various, *Religion in the Public Schools* (1s. 6d.); Bishop F. de Witt Batty, *The Australian Proposals for Intercommunion* (2s.); Kenneth Mackenzie (Ed.), *Truth, Unity and Concord* (4s. 6d.); E. R. Hougham, *Plays of Perplexity* (3s. 9d.); Lesbia Scott, *Then Will She Return* (a play in three acts) (2s.); A. W. Hopkinson, *About William Law* (8s. 6d.); F. B. Hutchinson, *Effective Membership* (6d.).

S.P.C.K. and N.S.: J. G. Williams, *God—and His World* (6s.); G. D. Barker, *A New Guide for Church School Managers, Governors and others interested in Church Day Schools* (6s. 6d.); Nancy Quayle, *Sunday to Sunday with the "Under Fives"* (4s. 6d.); J. M. Corley, *Mighty in Deed and Word* (5s. 6d.); C. H. Plummer, *The Parochial Youth Group* (3s.); M. E. A. Clark, *The Lord Reigneth* (Junior Grade Sunday School Lessons) (5s.).

S.P.G.: F. M. Blaxall, *Mapupula* (*The One who Touches*) (3s. 6d.); George West, *Jungle Witnesses* (3s. 6d.); Ruth Henrich, *Heroes of the Church Today* (Stories from the Far East) (3s. 6d.).

Titus Wilson and Son: C. M. L. Bouch, *Prelates and People of the Lake Countries* (21s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher